

**LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS QUARTERLY MEETING
FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
TUCSON, AZ
JULY 27-29, 1999**

PARTICIPANTS:

MANAGEMENT:

**Joe Chapin
Phillis Morgan
Joe Smith
Tamara Loury
Connie Darne
Don Laliberte
Bill Branch
Nikki Gallo**

UNION:

**Phil Glover
Jim Turner
Steve Croman
Charlie Bohannon
Allen Green
Manny Borquez
Paul Rissler
Mark Beyer
Joe Haneke
Gary Hungerford**

Subject Matter Experts:

**Yvonne Hinkson
Scott Bomson
Carol Herman
Gil Rivera
Bill Muth
Susan VanBaalen
Robbie Church
John Lee
Matt Korbela
Donna Olive
Pete Collins**

POLICIES NEGOTIATED

SEE SEPARATELY ATTACHED POLICY NEGOTIATION NOTES ON:

P.S. 3420.XX:	Fund Raising by Employees
P.S. 4500.04 (CN-5):	Trust Fund/Warehouse/Laundry Manual
C.N. 1600.07:	Occupational Safety & Environmental Health

Summary of Issues Addressed During LMR Meeting:

Fund Raising by Employees
Trust Fund/Warehouse/Laundry Manual
Occupational Safety and Environmental Health
Staff Suicide Data
Completion of Investigations
DCT and SORT
Special Needs Inmates at Taft
Reduction in Employee Development Positions
Disparate Treatment of Union Officials
Asbestos Exposure
Basic Prisoner Transportation (BPT) Standards
Retention of Disciplinary and Investigation Files
Welfare-to-Work Participants
Credit Reports
Frisk Master Gloves
MTM Shields
Statute of Limitations on OIA Cases
Legal Representation of Staff
Negotiations of Appropriate Arrangements at Local Level
Escort Duty
Assigning GS-8 Officers as Operations Lieutenants
Consolidation of FDC/FCI Oakdale

National Agenda Items: UNION

1. **ISSUE:** “The Union requests the statistical data regarding BOP staff suicides. This would include race, institution, age, retirement status (i.e., pending retirement or new employee), and position at the institution.”

Response: Management provided the Union with a copy of a report generated by the Human Resources Research and Development Section (HRRD). The report indicated that we had four staff members commit suicide in 1997, and one in 1998. Thus far in 1999, four staff members have committed suicide. The average is three staff suicides per year which is below the current national average of 12 per 100,000. The Union also asked for the statistics for inmate suicides, to which Dr. Ben Wheat of the Employee Assistance Program responded that there are an average of 12 inmates per year that commit suicide which is also below the national average of 19. The Union was satisfied with the data provided.

2. **ISSUE:** “Discussion of information requested above including any plan the BOP has incorporated or is looking at to identify potential suicide risks. What prevention programs exist now for staff in the areas of mental health?”

Response: Management advised the Union that the Agency’s emphasis will continue to be the availability of confidential assistance to staff through the Employee Assistance Program (EAP). The EAP is discussed each year at Annual Refresher Training (ART). It is also taught during Institution Familiarization classes and at Glynco. The Agency has highly trained psychologists at each institution that are committed to assisting staff with their personal issues and problems. The EAP is considered a vital function for Psychology Services and is closely evaluated during all operational reviews and program reviews. We especially emphasize confidentiality in our publicity for the program. In regard to staff suicides, the Agency remains very reluctant to discuss staff suicides during ART. The privacy of the staff members and their families is very important. For these same

reasons, we have refrained from doing any formal after-action review of staff suicides.

The Union asked who currently pays for the therapy of an employee who may be suicidal and wants counseling. Management responded that the EAP is a free referral program and after visits with a Bureau psychologist, the employee's insurance may pay for some of the cost of a private psychologist or psychiatrist. Management went on to state that it does not believe the Bureau should pay for an employee's long-term counseling whether it be in relation to depression or another situation such as alcoholism. The Union asked about a 1-800 contact number that seems to be located in only one region. Management contacted Dr. Wheat who confirmed that the 1-800 contact was currently only in one region.

This was a discussion item only.

3. **ISSUE:** "Investigations are not being completed in a timely manner at USP Lompoc, CA. This was addressed with the Regional Director. Some interviews have taken 6 months to complete."

Response: Management explained that the actions of the FBI, OIG and other similar agencies are out of the control of the Bureau despite previous efforts to speed up processes. The Union asked that Management send the OIG a letter asking them to expedite the investigation process. Management explained that BOP's Chief of the Office of Internal Affairs talks to the OIG almost on a daily basis and writing a letter will not be any more effective than personal conversations. The Union was satisfied with the discussion.

4. **ISSUE:** "It appears that DCT and SORT are consuming more money and staffing requirements. We have requested Gary Hungerford, President, Local 3955, Tucson, to speak on staffing issues related to this."

Response: The Union explained that the issue they were concerned with is that staff who are on SORT and DCT have to train during day

hours and thus, positions are vacated because some of the SORT and DCT members work evening or morning hours and their positions need to be filled. The staff who are filling in for SORT and DCT members are not being paid overtime and are having problems with day care, etc. The Union provided sample schedules. The Union stated that they didn't disagree with the fact that SORT and DCT training is important; it's the skeleton crews of staff that are the problem.

Management provided cost and personnel figures to the Union for SORT and DCT. Information which had been provided by Scott Dodrill during the January LMR Meeting was also reiterated. The Union was satisfied with the initial cost information but stated that they would continue to explore other options in the meantime. The Union went on to ask for cost figures for equipment expenses. Management provided this information to the Union by the end of the meeting. Union and Management informally discussed various options, including having regional SORT teams.

5. **ISSUE:** "Does Taft, CA house any special needs inmates (medical, psych)? If so, how many and how does that relate to inmates in the other comparable institutions for per capita?"

Response: Management provided the Union with a written explanation of the issue as provided by the Privatization and Special Projects Branch. Management explained that Taft's Statement of Work binds the contractor, Wackenhut Corrections Corporation (WCC), to the same standards and criteria for designations as any other federal institution, i.e., P.S. 5100.06 (Security Designation and Custody Classification Manual Management); and Chapter 7, Section 2 of the Health Services Manual. As far as per capita costs, it was explained to the Union that the contract specifies that the Bureau pays WCC a set amount per month rather than on a per capita or per diem basis. When the Bureau exceeds the average daily population of 1,946 inmates per monthly payment period, the Agency pays a fixed incremental unit price of \$5.58 per inmate per day. Management went on to state that the contract with WCC contains no catastrophic limit and the

contractor is responsible for all costs associated with operating the facility to include any outside medical costs.

The Union informed Management that some Case Managers in the field have informed the Union's Executive Board that, through their experiences, they believe there is some sort of screening going on for inmates who are specifically going to Taft. Management stated that they did not know of anything different happening but offered to look into it at the regional level. A bit later in the meeting, after consulting with one of the regional offices, Management informed the Union that the agency does watch how many inmates are going to Taft because, per the contract (see above explanation), the agency is only allowed a certain number of inmates. However, as far as special needs inmates, the regional designator makes the final determination and there is no indication that there is a different screening process for Taft.

6. **ISSUE:** "Since EDM has been cut as part of the "reinventing government", how is the agency compensating and providing employees with training and upward mobility avenues?"

Response: The Union indicated that there is one Employee Development position being cut at every institution and the concern is how employees are expected to get access to training with fewer staff. Management responded that although there are positions being cut, the training standards are not being changed, and the program reviews and Institution Character Profiles show that nothing has changed. In addition, all cross development courses have just been updated; staff only need to check the course out and take the test. This will not be impacted by one less staff member. Management also stated that local colleges participate with the Bureau to offer training courses.

7. **ISSUE:** "There appears to be disparate treatment of union officials at FDC Miami and FCI Talladega. It appears more investigations/disciplinary actions are occurring against union officials at these locations that is proportionate to the rest of the bargaining unit or Management. The Southeast Regional

Director is aware of this and chooses to do nothing to stop it.”

Response: Management indicated that after speaking with staff at Talladega and the FLRA, Management and Union representatives agreed to wait until the new Warden has come on board at the institution (around August 1st) to resolve the issues involved in the ULPs. The Union said they are concerned with waiting until the new Warden comes because usually new Wardens back up decisions made by previous Wardens. Management reiterated that the Union representatives involved in the case agreed to wait.

As far as the situation at FDC Miami, the incident which occurred when the Southeast Regional Vice President came to visit the institution has been resolved.

8. **ISSUE:** “There continues to be shortages of staff all the Southeast institutions and vacating of posts.”

Response: This issue was dropped by the Union considering it had been discussed at previous LMR meetings and it had been touched upon during the discussion about SORT.

9. **ISSUE:** “Asbestos exposure occurred at Puerto Rico. OSHA confirmed it. Employees have not received medical testing that worked in the area and were not paid for the exposure according to pay laws. This case is proceeding to arbitration, however, it should be settled by the Central Office.”

Response: Management explained their research revealed that OSHA had informed the Agency, in a written report addressed to the employee involved, that the institution was in compliance with all necessary requirements. The employee was given 30 days to respond to the report and he did not respond. This report seems to contradict what the Union had alleged. Management indicated that the institution has asked OSHA for a sanitized copy of the report (i.e, without any employee identifiers) so that it may be forwarded to the Union. Management stated this was an ongoing arbitration and any further dealings to settle or clarify

the case should be directed to the LMR specialist in the Central Office who was assigned to the case.

10. **ISSUE:** “BOP increased the qualifications standards for BPT, however, there was not any additional training time to raise the employees’ ability to qualify.”

Response: The Union indicated that the Basic Prisoner Transportation (BPT) course standards at FCI McKean have already been changed and thus, this is a change in working conditions and there should have been negotiations before implementation. Management responded that it was unaware that the changes had gone into effect but the intent behind the changes was to standardize the minimum requirements across the board. In addition, Management believes it has the right to determine qualifications for this program.

The Union asked if more training would be provided to staff who could not meet the new standards. Management indicated that at present, it doesn’t appear that staff need additional training. In addition, they asked the Union to address this at the local level (FCI McKean) since this seemed to be the only institution using the new standards. The Union responded that this will be a national issue once all staff start having to meet the new standards to which Management responded that a training schedule could not be set for problems that are unknown at this time.

Later in the meeting, Management informed the Union that changes to the BPT course have not been made yet and the Operations Memorandum (OM) which makes the changes is currently in draft form. Once the OM has gone through the formal clearance process, it will be routed to the Union for review.

11. **ISSUE:** “It was discovered during a case at McKean that a file was maintained on the Union President regarding past discipline that was overturned by an arbitrator. This information was then used to attempt to discredit the Union official on another case. In

light of this information, the Union is requesting the following:

- A. Is the agency keeping disciplinary records past the two year reckoning period, if so, what purpose does it serve and what policy allows it?"
- B. Is the agency keeping investigations that are either inconclusive, no action taken, or any action taken it thrown out by a third party? Again, if so, for what purpose and what policy allows it?
- C. Is the agency keeping any records on staff of past discipline or adverse action if it was thrown out by a third party? If so, in what records and what policy allows it?

Response: A. Management informed the Union that the General Records Schedule mandates that agencies keep disciplinary files for a period of 4 to 7 years. It is up to the individual agency to determine the exact time frame within those parameters. The Union asked where they could get that schedule; Management gave the internet address for the website. The Union argued that the Agency may be able to retain the file but that law (none specified) does not allow the Agency to use the file in order to discredit an employee or to simply provide to a Regional Director, Captain, etc.. Management stated that they know of no law which prohibits the use of the file for official purposes. Management did agree that a closed file shouldn't be used for progressive discipline purposes if the issue at hand is within the reckoning period. However, Management also stated that if the Union wants a copy of the file, they can get a copy as long as the employee gives his/her permission, it is past the two year reckoning period and the file is still being kept at the institution.

B. Management informed that Union that investigatory files are kept a minimum of 10 years, although the Correctional Services Manual says they may be kept indefinitely.

C. This issue was covered when discussing the first two parts of this question.

The Union asked to table this entire issue (i.e., retention and use of files) until they could do further research and contact their legal sources. Later in the meeting, the Union asked Management to provide (per AFGE's direction) a written

explanation of why the Agency feels the need to retain these files. Management responded that the General Records Schedule is the written direction and the Agency is mandated to follow that schedule. The Union said that the Schedule does not indicate which files need to be kept, e.g., those cases that were dismissed, those cases that were sustained, etc. The Union went on to say that they will start putting in their remedy to arbitrators that they wish the files and all records pertaining to the case to be destroyed. Both parties agreed to table the issue until further research could be done.

12. **ISSUE:** “Welfare-to-Work participant, Fairton, NJ. Welfare-to-Work people were to be hired in a training capacity. Fairton has placed the GS-1 in a Correctional Officer capacity, has eliminated a roster position because of the Welfare-to-Work person, and has created post orders which reflect GS-5 or GS-6 Correctional Officer duties. This is not what the Union understands as proper use of these required Welfare-to-Work positions.”

Response: The Union stated that at FCI Fairton, a Correctional Officer who had been working at the Front Desk was reassigned to a Unit and the Front Desk position was then filled with a Welfare-to-Work worker-trainee. When Management responded that the person at the Front Desk was answering the phones, the Union stated that the person should be trained to do clearance and the duties which that person is performing are straight from the roster (witsec duties). The Union believes that this was not the intention for the worker-trainees; they believed they would be doing strictly clerical work.

Management stated that they did not agree with the idea that worker-trainees would only be performing clerical duties. It is not illegal to put these staff in any position. However, there should be Impact and Implementation bargaining associated with such placements. If this did not occur at FCI Fairton, it is the responsibility of the institution to do so.

The Union asked to table the issue.

13. **ISSUE:** “ADX - agency pulled credit report without employees consent or knowledge, then began an investigation on employee. The Union believes the Fair Credit Reporting Act requires the agency to get the employee’s permission each time a report is requested.”

Response: Management indicated that when a new employee enters the Bureau, he or she signs a new form which allows the Bureau to pull not only the initial credit report necessary to obtain employment, but also subsequent credit reports. This one form and signature is good for the entire duration of employment with the Bureau of Prisons. For those employees who entered the Bureau prior to the new form, they are asked at the time of their reinvestigations to sign the new form. The Union asked why an employee cannot get a copy of their credit report from the Agency when it is being used against him or her. Management stated that if the Agency is taking some adverse action against an employee, it does provide that employee with a copy at no cost. However, for all other employees, Management is currently looking into amending the Equifax contract to include language that allows the employee to obtain a hard copy of the report.

A lengthy discussion followed regarding the definition of “just debts” and how an employee clears up discrepancies found on the credit report. Management explained that as long as the employee shows documentation indicating that the debt is not his/hers or that some sort of payment plan and/or attempt at resolution has been made with a creditor, that is a sufficient for the Agency. The Union argued that if something on a credit report is not considered a “just debt” as defined by law and the Master Agreement, then it should be of no concern to the Agency. Management stated that it has to follow the parameters which the Department of Justice (DOJ) has created, one of which includes the duty to resolve issues on the credit report which may not be “just debts”.

Management gave the Union a copy of a November 1997 memo which was provided to all Human Resource Administrators and Managers regarding credit reports. Management agreed to put something out to the field again specifying the difference between

an “adverse action” from the Bureau’s disciplinary standpoint and an “adverse action” in the sense that this also refers to anything on a credit report which the employee is required to address, even if it is not considered a “just debt” in the legal sense.

Both parties agreed to table the issue until further research could be done and Management could consult with DOJ.

14. **ISSUE:** “IAW Article 27, Section a.2. and Section b. of the CBA, the Union is requesting that the Bureau of Prisons provide the following items nationwide to all staff:
- A. Frisk master gloves for the conducting of area searches at all facilities. This is due in part to the rash of recent staff injuries (needle sticks, razor cuts). The Bureau at times has provided medical treatment for these types of injuries relating to blood borne pathogens and hepatitis. This we believe is more cost effective than the required treatment recommended by health care professionals. The medication to treat these diseases is very expensive on the open market and this risk reducer could save money overall. P.S. 1600.07 also states that Personal Protective Equipment shall be provided and worn IAW 29 CFR OSHA 1926.
 - B. MTM Shields for all staff working at our facilities. These pouches can be purchased that will contain 1 mtm one-way valve resuscitation tube, 1 pair of latex gloves which can be worn with the key chains issued to all staff. Due to a recent staff incident at FCI Petersburg concerning an order given by a health care professional to conduct CPR and mouth-to-mouth none of this equipment was readily available for staff use. Now staff have to be medically treated against HIV and hepatitis.”

Response: A. Management discussed that there are many different gloves that can be used for searching, some of which have kevlar coating and some have fingertip padding. However, these gloves alone cannot guarantee that staff will be guarded against razor blade

cuts and needle punctures. Also, one's tactile sensitivity could be lost when using thick gloves. Management suggested a better remedy might be training in technique and using tools, e.g., mirrors, pens. The Union stated that many institutions do not have tools and believe having the gloves would at least reduce the occurrences of staff injury when doing searches. Management is concerned that staff will get a false sense of security if they begin to think gloves will protect them from injury. Management also stated that they could recommend to the institutions that tools be available for searches, however, the Union indicated using mirrors does not work very well for morning watch searches when there is limited light.

After a discussion about the cost of gloves (about \$40 for one pair), Management agreed to check with the Security and Technology staff to see if they could find a pair of suitable gloves. Both parties then agreed that a pilot could be done with those gloves. Details of the pilot will be worked out if and when a pair of gloves can be located.

B. The Union circulated an MTM shield kit which contained a mouth piece and rubber gloves so participants were aware of the issue at hand. Management stated that the current system and BOP policy mandates the kits be accessible in the event of an emergency. The Union said such a kit was not available to staff at Petersburg. Management responded that they could not comment on the Petersburg situation as it is currently under investigation. The Union wants every employee nationwide in the Bureau to have one of these kits. Management said that currently every department has a kit and every employee is supposed to know where that kit is in the event of an emergency. Management agreed to send a message to the field to instruct medical staff do an inventory of the kits, making sure that the kits are where they are supposed to be and ensuring staff know exactly where the kits are in the institution.

15. **ISSUE:** "The Union would like to know the statute of limitations on closed non-sustained OIA cases. Recently, the OIG in a case at FCI Beckley requested a file on a staff member from OIA that was

dated July 1993. This case was a closed file and the allegations were not sustained.”

Response: This issue was resolved, per the Union, and withdrawn.

16. **ISSUE:** “The Union would like an explanation as to why the Bureau of Prisons will not provide legal representation in inmates’ Civil Rights cases when the Agency SIS or SIA has cleared staff from all alleged allegations and/or pay or reimburse private counsel to represent these employees when DOJ refuses.”

Response: This was resolved in that the Agency provided an explanation at previous meetings, however, there were follow-up questions. The Union asked why the Bureau only pays \$99 out of \$150 for legal costs. Management agreed to look into it. The Union then asked about the thoroughness of information provided to staff regarding legal representation. Management responded that this information is provided to staff during Annual Refresher Training but the Union said not all the parameters of the representation process are explained. Both Management and the Union agreed that at an upcoming LMR Meeting, it would be beneficial to have a Department of Justice (DOJ) employee available to speak to these issues. Management agreed that they would invite a representative from DOJ, though they could not guarantee that someone would come to the meeting.

17. **ISSUE:** “Why does the Agency refuse to negotiate appropriate arrangements when it decides to remove or replace positions at the local level (FCI Alderson, FCI Ashland, FCI Elkton, FCI Cumberland, FCI Milan, FCI Manchester, FCI Petersburg).”

Response: This issue was resolved, per the Union, and withdrawn.

18. **ISSUE:** “Why won’t the Agency use its compliment of staff member s to provide construction escort duty in its facility. FCI Ashland Management has proposed to use contract security staff or even BOP retirees. The Union feels this is a threat to staff and inmates

for security reasons.”

Response: The Management at Ashland indicated they had talked about hiring contract employees to provide escort, but were told that the Agency cannot hire contract employees to watch other contract employees. So for now, they will pull staff from the roster, or use other staff to watch and escort the construction contract employees. Currently, the contract staff are outside the fence doing sewer construction, so it hasn't been a potential security problem. However, when the work moves inside, Management imagines it will become more difficult. No decisions have yet been made on who is going to do the escorting, but for now, it certainly won't be contract staff or reemployed annuitants. Management went on to question why so many local issues were being brought to the National LMR Meeting.

This was a discussion item only.

19. **ISSUE:** “Why does FPC Alderson constantly pull GS-8 Officers for Operations Lieutenant positions on all three shifts. This reduces the already short compliment by using these officers to perform supervisory functions. GS-8 Officers are also used to go to the Southern Regional Jail to serve incident reports when there are lieutenants on duty (21 times this past quarter GS-8s were pulled for lieutenant duties and 4 times sent to the jail to serve incident reports).”

Response: Both Management and the Union agreed that it is a management right to order a bargaining unit staff member to be a supervisory employee. They also agreed that the GS-8 staff member assigned to be an Operations Lieutenant, for example, might not be happy with that assignment but it still may happen occasionally.

The Union stated that after a meeting with the new Warden, they believe this issue may be resolved.

20. **ISSUE:** “Consolidation of FDC Oakdale and FCI Oakdale - What is the status of FDC Oakdale? Whole departments are being displaced. Is the Agency going to have one institution or two? Staff morale

is very low.”

Response: Management indicated that the Executive Staff decided Oakdale would not become a Complex. However, certain departments (e.g., personnel) would be consolidated, although there have been some concerns. Mr. Thompson indicated that he would be taking a closer look at Oakdale as the new Regional Director.

The Union stated that the facilities department has also been consolidated within the last month and has been moved to the FCI. Staff do not know what bargaining unit they belong under. In addition, the locator codes (ALC) for Butner and Oakdale are currently only one code for each, instead of being separated like Allenwood's facilities. The Union interprets this one code as reflecting a complex. The Union would like to have Butner, Lompoc and Oakdale's locator codes separated again. Management agreed that they would look into this.

July 27-29, 1999 Quarterly LMR Meeting

❖ **P.S. 3420.XX: FUND RAISING BY EMPLOYEES**

Proposal #1: The Employees Club is allowed to sell t-shirts, mugs, etc. Can the Union do the same thing?

Response: The Union indicated that it is disparate treatment to allow the Employees Club to sell items but not the Union. Management pointed out that *41 CFR, Chapter 101, Subsection 20.308* states that labor organizations can only solicit for dues and membership on government property; they cannot sell items on government property. *5 CFR, Chapter 1, Section 950.102, subsection d*, goes on to state that the Employees Club is the only exception to selling items on government property. The term “selling” was discussed and interpreted as meaning receiving a profit from a sale. The Union indicated that they are a non-profit organization and not a commercial entity.

Both parties agreed to table this proposal until further research could be done.

Proposal #2: Is it prohibited for the Union to raise money for staff who have had an emergency, tragedy, etc.?

Response: Management informed the Union that Bureau policy states that employees can raise funds for disasters, emergencies, etc. To establish a fund, the Union needs to go through the proper channels, including obtaining the approval of the Bureau’s Ethics Officer.

July 27-29, 1999 Quarterly LMR Meeting

❖ **CN 1600.07: OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH**

In Chapter 3, Section N (Fire Related Equipment), #7e, the following language was agreed upon by both Management and the Union, and will be added to the aforementioned portion of the policy:

“ All self-contained breathing apparatus will be inspected by qualified safety staff monthly, and all breathing apparatus will be stored on wall mounts with a breakaway security device to avoid or indicate inmate tampering.”

July 27-29, 1999 Quarterly LMR Meeting

❖ **P.S. 4500.04 (CN-5): TRUST FUND/WAREHOUSE/LAUNDRY MANUAL**

The Union proposed that Special Purpose Orders (SPOs) be reduced in quantity from a maximum of three each month to a maximum of one each quarter. They also wanted to have two lists, one with a listing of authorized items and one with unauthorized items. The Union believes that the workload due to the amount of SPOs is high and that inmates should not be able to order brand name items when the exact same item in a generic brand is already available.

Management representatives from the Trust Fund Branch, Correctional Services, Religious Services and Education spoke to the Union's concerns. Management indicated that SPOs are an integral part of most Bureau hobbycraft programs and these programs contribute to the pro-social, leisure-time skills which allow inmates to develop constructive habits. In addition, the Trust Fund Branch is in the process of revising P.S. 5370.08 (Recreation Program, Inmates) in which there is language which will limit hobbycraft purchases to \$300 per quarter.

Management went on to state that not only have stricter controls over inmate personal property reduced the volume of supplies allowed, but current policy states that inmates are not allowed to order brand name supplies. There is a certain approval process in place and if that is not occurring, it is a violation of policy.

Management also referenced the First Amendment and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act which requires the Agency to ensure the religious rights of the Bureau's inmates. This includes providing them with special food substitutes and religious items for purposes of worship.

The Union did not agree with the information Management presented. Management responded that the Union's proposal was similar in nature to limiting how many visitors an inmate will have. After much discussion, Management declared the proposals non-negotiable.